

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER: _____**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/995,224	11/26/2001	Adrian Conor Klein	MSFT-0672/158461.I	9650
7590	10/05/2004		EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP			RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
46th Floor One Liberty Place Philadelphia, PA 19103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/995,224	KLEIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Laurie Ries	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 6,12, and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11/26/01 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/9/04</u>	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- Page 15, lines 13-14, "Part of the second listener's responsibilities is to upon the detection of a refresh to attach a On Unload event on the page" should read: "Part of the second listener's responsibilities is, upon the detection of a refresh, to attach an On Unload event on the page".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claims 6 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- Claim 6, line 2 – "response" should read "responsive"
- Claim 12, line 4 – "generated" should read "generate"

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 21 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7-8 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 is recites the limitation "additional associated links" in line 1. Should one of the other possible features set forth in claim 7 be selected, there would be insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 7 is in improper Markush group format. The Office suggests that line 2 be reworded to read: "comprising any of a group consisting of..."

Claim 22 is recites the limitation "predefined associated link lists" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

As per claim 23, it is unclear as to the metes and bounds of the claim since the limitation recites a computer readable medium, however, the independent claim upon which it depends is directed toward a method.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-9 and 21 are directed to software programs, per se, not tangibly embodied in a computer readable medium.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 10-12, 15-20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goodisman (U.S. Publication 2002/0069223 A1).

As per claim 1, Goodisman discloses a method providing associated links in online content including a helper object, or linkify engine, which cooperates with the computing browsing application to parse the content (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053), and a recognizer, or pattern matcher, that cooperates with the linkify engine or helper object to compare the content with a predefined list of key-phrases and/or syntactic rules for recognizing key-phrase candidates. (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053).

As per claim 2, Goodisman discloses at least one action handler, or targeting feature, to execute at least one pre-defined action related to the associated links. (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053, and Page 7, paragraph 0056).

As per claim 4, Goodisman discloses that the computing application includes a content browser computing application. (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053).

As per claim 7, Goodisman discloses that the associated links offer features including additional associated links, which is included in the list of possible features set forth in claim 7. (See Goodisman, Pages 3-4, paragraph 0037).

As per claim 10, Goodisman discloses that the computing browser-type application resides on a client computer of a networked computer environment. (See Goodisman, Figure 3, elements 42 and 48).

As per claim 11, Goodisman discloses that the received content is received from at least one computer server of the networked computer environment. (See Goodisman, Figure 3, element 44).

As per claim 12, Goodisman discloses a method providing associated links in online content, including receiving online content by a computing application from a cooperating content server over a communications network (See Goodisman, Page 3, paragraphs 0032-0033), parsing the received online content by a helper object, or linkify engine, to generate parsed online content, where the helper object or linkify engine cooperates with the computing application (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053), comparing the parsed content by at least one recognizer, or pattern matcher, to a predefined list of associated links to identify match true associated links (See

Goodisman, Page 6 paragraph 0053), and incorporating match true associated links in the received online content by the computing application to generate processed content for display to participating users (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053).

As per claim 15, Goodisman discloses executing the match true associated links upon interaction from participating users, the interaction being realized through at least one input from a user interface with the match true associated links. (See Goodisman, Page 3, paragraphs 0035-0036, Page 4, paragraph 0038, and Page 7, paragraph 0059).

As per claim 16, Goodisman discloses aggregating content associated with the executed associated link, the aggregated content including any of a group including additional associated links, additional relevant content related to the executed content, execution commands for search operations, and execution commands to launch cooperating applications (See Goodisman, Page 3-4, paragraph 0037), and generating an interactive display pane, which is populated with the aggregated content. (See Goodisman, Page 3-4, paragraph 0037).

As per claim 17, Goodisman discloses separating the received online content into phrases and communicating the phrases to the recognizer, or pattern matcher. (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053).

As per claim 18, Goodisman discloses processing the phrases to identify any words that are contained in the predefine list of associated links. (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053).

As per claim 19, Goodisman discloses highlighting the match true associated links such that they appear having a different color and/or format than surrounding non-associated link content. (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053).

As per claim 20, Goodisman discloses a computer readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the steps in claim 12. (See Goodisman, Page 7, paragraphs 0060 and 0062).

As per claim 22, Goodisman discloses modifying the existing predefined associated link lists to include data on the obtained associated link lists. (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodisman (U.S. Publication 2002/0069223 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Baird (U.S. Publication 2003/0080986 A1).

As per claim 3, Goodisman discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Goodisman does not disclose expressly replacing existing predefined associated link lists with obtained associated link lists. Baird discloses updating a list of links upon the execution of a preconfigured event. Goodisman and Baird are analogous

art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating online content. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the updating of a list of links of Baird with the replacement of associated link lists of Goodisman. The motivation for doing so would have been to remove links which have become outdated or are no longer available. (See Baird, Page 2, paragraph 0021). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Baird with Goodisman for the benefit of removing outdated links to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

As per claim 21, Goodisman discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Goodisman also discloses a method to automatically update a predefined list of associated links of the associated link system (See Goodisman, Claim 37), providing an update engine on a computing application incorporating associated links in online content (See Goodisman, Claim 34). Goodisman does not disclose expressly obtaining data indicative of an updated associated link list upon the passing of a predefined event. Goodisman also does not disclose expressly replacing existing predefined associated link lists with obtained associated link lists. Baird discloses updating a list of links upon the execution of a preconfigured event. Goodisman and Baird are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating online content. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the updating of a list of links of Baird with the replacement of associated link lists of Goodisman. The motivation for doing so would have been to remove links which have become outdated or are no longer available. (See Baird, Page 2, paragraph

0021). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Baird with Goodisman for the benefit of removing outdated links to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

As per claim 23, Goodisman and Baird disclose the limitations of claim 21 as described above. Goodisman also discloses a computer readable medium having computer readable instructions for performing the steps recited in claim 21. (See Goodisman, Page 7, paragraphs 0060 and 0062).

Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodisman (U.S. Publication 2002/0069223 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 6,222,537 B1).

As per claims 5 and 6, Goodisman discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Goodisman does not disclose expressly the inclusion of a first and second listener including a set of instructions to monitor and be responsive to interaction with the computing application. Smith discloses the use of event listener objects which include a set of instructions to monitor and interact with a computing application. (See Smith, Column 8, lines 23-32). Goodisman and Smith are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of accessing information online. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the event listener objects of Smith with the method and system of providing associated links of Goodisman. The motivation for doing so would have been to be aware of events triggered by user interaction. (See Smith, Column 8, lines 28-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Smith with Goodisman for the benefit of tracking user interaction to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 6.

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodisman (U.S. Publication 2002/0069223 A1) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647).

As per claims 8 and 9, Goodisman discloses the limitations of claim 7 as described above. Goodisman does not disclose expressly that the additional associated links are related to an underlying associated link. Horowitz discloses additional associated links that are related to an underlying associated link. (See Horowitz, Figure 5). Goodisman and Horowitz are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of dynamically generating contextual links. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the additional associated links related to an underlying associated link of Horowitz with the additional associated links of Goodisman. The motivation for doing so would have been to generate new links from the target document that may be available or relevant. (See Horowitz, Column 2, lines 23-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Horowitz with Goodisman for the benefit of providing additional relevant links to obtain the invention as specified in claims 8 and 9.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodisman (U.S. Publication 2002/0069223 A1) as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Kippenhan (U.S. Publication 2002/0010769 A1).

As per claim 13, Goodisman discloses the limitations of claim 12 as described above. Goodisman also discloses displaying the generated processed content to participating users through a cooperating display device. (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053, Figure 3, element 42, and Page 5, paragraph 0050). Goodisman does not disclose expressly monitoring the activity of the participating users with the match true associated links of generated processed content to offer content associated with the associated links. Kippenhan discloses monitoring user activity on a web browser. (See Kippenhan, Page 3, paragraph 0032). Kippenhan and Goodisman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of accessing information online. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the monitoring of user activity on the browser of Kippenhan with the method of providing associated links of Goodisman. The motivation for doing so would have been to identify and provide additional information about a given subject of interest to a user. (See Kippenhan, Page 1, paragraph 0010). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kippenhan with Goodisman for the benefit of identifying and providing the user with additional information of interest to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodisman (U.S. Publication 2002/0069223 A1) and Kippenhan (U.S. Publication 2002/0010769 A1) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 6,222,537 B1).

As per claim 14, Goodisman and Kippenhan disclose the limitations of claim 13 as described above. Goodisman and Kippenhan do not disclose expressly the inclusion of a first and second listener including a set of instructions to monitor and be responsive to interaction with the computing application. Smith discloses the use of event listener objects which include a set of instructions to monitor and interact with a computing application. (See Smith, Column 8, lines 23-32). Goodisman, Kippenhan and Smith are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of accessing information online. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the event listener objects of Smith with the method and system of providing associated links of Goodisman and Kippenhan. The motivation for doing so would have been to be aware of events triggered by user interaction. (See Smith, Column 8, lines 28-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Smith with Goodisman and Kippenhan for the benefit of tracking user interaction to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Miller (U.S. Publication 2002/0143808 A1) discloses A method and system for creating hypertext links for all or select proper nouns found in a document or web page on the Internet or world wide web.
- Bhatia (U.S. Publication 2002/0154162 A1) discloses computer software, systems and methods for providing context personalized browsing over computer networks.
- Delgado (U.S. Publication 2002/0052873 A1) discloses a system and method for searching data repositories and for obtaining user preferences and providing user recommendations for unseen physical and information goods and services.
- Subramanian (U.S. Publication 2004/0078265 A1) discloses a system and method for presenting to a user relevant areas of distributed computer network sites.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is currently (703) 605-1238. After mid-October, 2004, the examiner can be reached at (571) 272-4095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00am to 3:30pm.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR

only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LAR



JOSEPH FEILD
SUPPLYORY PATENT EXAMINER